DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 188 584 IR 008 436

AUTHOR Haenn, Joseph F.
TITLE Development of Comprehensive State Dissemination Plans: An Overview of Present Status.
PUB DATE Apr 80
NOTE 21p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, April 1980)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Planning; Federal Aid; *Grants; *Information Dissemination; *Program Development; Regional Planning; Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS *National Institute of Education; *State Dissemination Grants Program

ABSTRACT

Established by NIE in June 1975, the State Dissemination Grants Program provides resources to state education agencies to develop comprehensive and generalized dissemination capacity, which is defined as the leadership and service capability to provide information and technical assistance in the solution of problems identified by the dissemination agency or its clientele. Generalized dissemination means providing access to all information resources for all educators regardless of subject field or role. A list of criteria, developed for use in examining comprehensive state dissemination plans, is applied to plans submitted as part of the State Dissemination Grants Program. These criteria include definition, rationale, resource catalog, needs sensing, clients linkage system, marketing strategy, coordination systems, delivery strategies, evaluation, program resources, integration system, advisory group, and documentation. As of February 1980, 11 states reported existence of such plans while 31 others responded negatively. It is concluded that unless comprehensive plans are developed within the first three years of SDGP it is unlikely that they will be developed in subsequent years: few plans were reported by states not involved in SDGP. A list of NTS Research Corporation papers presented at AERA in 1980 is attached. (RAA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED188584

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Development of Comprehensive State Dissemination Plans: An Overview of Present Status

Joseph F. Haenn

Joseph F. Haenn
NTS Research Corporation
2634 Chapel Hill Boulevard
Durham, North Carolina 27707

Paper presented in a session sponsored
by the Special Interest Group on Research Utilization
at the AERA Annual Meeting, Boston, Massachusetts,
April 1980.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joseph F. Haenn

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

IR008436

Development of Comprehensive State Dissemination Plans: An Overview of Present Status[1]

Joseph F. Haenn
NTS Research Corporation

Established by the National Institute of Education in June 1975, the State Dissemination Grants Program provides resources to state education agencies (SEAs) to develop "comprehensive and generalized" dissemination capacity. NIE perceives the concept of "comprehensive" dissemination capacity as "the leadership and service capability to provide information and technical assistance in the solution of problems identified by the dissemination agency or its clientele" (NIE, 1978, p. 11).

Components of comprehensive capacity include:

- Information Resources, that is, "a full range of resources including data, documents, products, and technical expertise."
- Linkage, that is, "means of linking the client group to the resource base," and
- Leadership, that is, "leadership and management arrangements which facilitate provision of services on any problem to all members of the client group" (NIE, 1978, p. 11).

Providing for generalized dissemination capacity means providing "access to all information resources for all educators regardless of subject field or role." (NIE, 1978, p. 12) The program announcements also emphasize that "state dissemination systems should serve the national goal of enhancing the equality of educational opportunity" (NIE, 1978, p. 11).

Two types of awards are made to SEAs through the SDGP:

- Capacity Building Grants, which average $100,000 each, support activities to develop the capability or readiness of an SEA to provide dissemination services to its constituents. These grants support SEA efforts to build a comprehensive and generalized state dissemination capacity program. Awards are of one-year duration and potentially renewable for three-to-five years.

---

[1] Paper presented in a session sponsored by the Special Interest Group on Research Utilization at the AERA Annual Meeting, Boston, Massachusetts, April 1980.

- Special Purpose Grants, which average $25,000 each, support relatively low-cost, short-term SEA improvement efforts related to building a dissemination program. These grants are used to support such SEA activities as initial planning, training of personnel, or the development of specific dissemination resources.

Since its inception in 1975, four cohorts of states have received SDGP grants. In 1975, ten states were awarded capacity building grants and five states received special purpose grants through the SDGP. In 1976, fourteen capacity building grants and five special purpose grants were awarded. In 1977, six additional capacity building grants and five more special purpose grants were awarded. In 1978, four new capacity building grants and five more special purpose grants were awarded.

Rationale for the Study

The program announcements for the SDGP do not indicate that comprehensive state dissemination plans need to be written either to qualify for or to insure continued funding of a Capacity Building Grant. The only plan referenced is the one cited in the proposal limitation that, "Each application should contain a comprehensive dissemination project plan which covers a three-to-five year period . . ." (NIE, 1978, p. 14). However, this project plan should not be confused with a comprehensive state plan that might encompass multiple programs and funding agencies. The Program Announcements do indicate that one appropriate use of a Special Purpose Grant might be the "preparation of a plan for a comprehensive knowledge dissemination and utilization program within a State" (NIE, 1978, p. 18). Such an endeavor would be a meaningful and perhaps necessary leadership activity, either prior to or during a dissemination Capacity Building effort. In fact, at least one state was awarded a special purpose grant after submitting a proposal

> . . . to develop a draft state dissemination plan. Include reviewing current dissemination efforts and assessing needs, utilizing inputs to SEA steering committee from participants on SEA staff, from ten selected

> persons from regional units and LEAs after visiting dissemination centers in other states and from contacts in other cooperating institutions (NIE, 1978, Appendix D, p. 31).

this state was later awarded a capacity building grant even though the proposed state dissemination plan was not developed.

Although the program announcements were never changed, Capacity Building project expectations changed as management personnel of the program changed at the federal level. One of the stronger expectations near the end of funding for the first cohort of projects was that a Capacity Building project should leverage, or at least assist in, the development of a comprehensive state dissemination plan.

Elements of a Comprehensive State Dissemination Plan

NTS Research Corporation has been conducting a multi-year evaluation of the Capacity Building Grant component of the SDGP. To investigate the development of comprehensive state dissemination plans in Capacity Building states, the NTS evaluators had to determine what such a plan might look like. Lacking a formal definition of the components of comprehensive state dissemination plans NTS took the following steps. First, the evaluators drew heavily from a paper by Charles Mojkowski (1978) containing the most complete enumeration extant of the essential elements and processes which need to be addressed in developing a comprehensive state dissemination plan. Second, those ideas were supplemented by elements drawn from a paper by the Dissemination Program of the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (1978) and by the ideas of the NTS study team derived from experience and theory. Third, these contributions were synthesized resulting in the elements for a comprehensive state dissemination plan listed in Table 1. A brief discussion of each of these elements is presented in the following sections.

Definition

Unless a common, comprehensive and working definition of dissemination exists within the State Education Agency (SEA) and perhaps across the state, differences in definition will lead to a lack of understanding and possible communication problems. Because most of the activities which now fall under the dissemination

Table 1

Elements of a Comprehensive State Dissemination Plan

1)	DEFINITION:	A comprehensive, working definition of dissemination at the state level.
2)	RATIONALE:	A description of the mission, goals and objectives of the total dissemination effort.
3)	RESOURCE CATALOG:	An inventory of the products, information and assistance which are or can be made available to respond to client needs.
4)	NEEDS SENSING:	A description of the needs-sensing mechanisms available or needed to collect and prioritize existing problems and necessary resources.
5)	CLIENTS:	A description of present target and potential audiences for dissemination services and their general information and assistance needs.
6)	LINKAGE SYSTEM:	A description of the linkages (to be) utilized to connect clients to resources.
7)	MARKETING STRATEGY:	A description of a strategy for establishing awareness of all available services.
8)	COORDINATION SYSTEM:	A delineation of the functions and responsibilities of the appropriate agents or organizational units.
9)	DELIVERY STRATEGIES:	A description of the strategies (to be) used for delivering services.
10)	EVALUATION:	A description of the monitoring/quality assurance/evaluation procedures.
11)	PROGRAM RESOURCES:	A description of the personnel and financial resources available to support items 1-10 above.
12)	INTEGRATION SYSTEM:	A description of the relationship between the comprehensive state dissemination plan, the SEA master plan(s) and the operational plans for conducting specific dissemination activities.
13)	ADVISORY GROUP	An advisory group is (was) involved in development of the plan.
14)	DOCUMENTATION	A thorough documentation of the comprehensive state dissemination plan available in writing. writing.

umbrella existed prior to the emergence of dissemination alone as a recognized activity, the term is often used to justify the activities of only a few people. Instead, the jargon of dissemination should be cast aside, or at least made interpretable, so "outsiders" can better understand dissemination activities. Many personnel are quite pleased to learn that some of their functions are recognized dissemination activities which can be added to their job descriptions. What teacher doesn't act as a linker or resource provider or isn't involved in spread, exchange, change or decision-making? What administrator doesn't have a need for a resource base or act as a process helper? If only they knew what this jargon is all about, how helpful the activities are, and how much they need these kind of activities!

Rationale

The dissemination effort should be focused and, to be focused, should have a mission, or some goal, or objectives, or all of these common guiding principles.

Resource Catalog

A resource catalog should be the disseminators bible. With the ever expanding number of types of resources available, the catalog should be developed in a form that is easy to update, which is cross-referenced and is easily transported. It should include a total inventory of the types of products, information and assistance which are available through the dissemination effort.

Linkage System

The linkages to connect clients to resources and vice versa should be described. By identifying clients and linkers, linkages on various levels can be employed.

Marketing Strategy

Everyone knows that it pays to advertise and that people cannot use resources they are unaware of. Therefore, a comprehensive dissemination plan should include a marketing strategy designed to promote available services.

Coordination System

Most state dissemination efforts consist of highly fragmented segments. To be most effective and efficient, a system should be developed for coordination which specifies functions and responsibilities of various dissemination components. It is important here that coordination not be confused with cooptation or control. Instead, each segment should perform one or more unique functions within the total dissemination system with a minimum of overlap and redundancy.

Delivery Strategies

Strategies should be devised for delivering certain types of information, products or services to specific types of clients utilizing appropriate linkages. For example, the results of a computerized bibliographic search for an experienced client might most efficiently be delivered by teletype, while a first time use might need personalized services to understand and best utilize the search package.

Evaluation

Procedures should be established for monitoring dissemination system activities, for assuring quality products and services and evaluating outcomes. An evaluation plan which addresses these areas should be part of the comprehensive state plan.

Program Resources

The numbers and types of personnel available within the various dissemination efforts, their training and roles and the budgetary considerations and constraints should be identified in the comprehensive state plan. Where possible, these resources should be broken down by project across the elements discussed above.

Integration System

A description of how the comprehensive state plan fits in with current and projected SEA goals and objectives should be included. By sharing this information with SEA leaders, they can better understand how the dissemination system interfaces with other SEA activities and include this information in their long

ange planning. In addition, the specific operational plans for each dissemination activity should be described.

Advisory Group

Although this element is not essential, the planning process should be

> . . .an open process, involving all appropriate individuals and organizational units in the SEA and in the state. Unless the planning process recognizes and honors the diverse interests of all stakeholders, the resulting plan will find less than adequate acceptance in the agency. For this reason, many projects have found it necessary and expedient to use agency-wide, even state-wide, advisory groups in the development of a plan (NIE, 1978, p. 3).

Documentation

Although this element is listed last, it is perhaps the most important element of all if the comprehensive state dissemination plan is to receive widespread acceptance and understanding. It cannot be considered to the comprehensive if it exists only in the minds of a few people and is not available for distribution.

Assessing the Status of Comprehensive State Dissemination Plans: November, 1978

Using the 14 elements identified in Table 1, the 29 Capacity Building projects from the first three cohorts which were operating in November of 1978 were asked whether or not they had a comprehensive state dissemination plan. As a follow-up, those projects with plans or portions of plans were asked to share them with the evaluation team. It should be noted that projects were not directly given the 14 elements of such a plan for reference, but all had received a draft of the Mojkowski (1978) paper which identified many of these same elements.

Using a checklist of these 14 elements, nine of the 29 projects did not have a comprehensive state dissemination plan at that time nor did they have intentions to develop one. Five projects did not have a written plan at the time, but using their current ideas were judged by the evaluation team as having a good potential for developing plans in the future. Ten projects were working

on comprehensive state plans at that time; of the ten, only one project had something on paper available for distribution, while the other nine plans existed in forms ranging from beginning conceptualizations to third-drafts which still had not been cleared for release. The findings of these assessments are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2

Status of Capacity Building Projects on the Development of Comprehensive State Dissemination Plans (November, 1978)

	Number and Percent of Projects by Cohort							
	Cohort I		Cohort II		Cohort III		Total	
Status of Plan	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Nothing in progress	3	33	4	29	2	33	9	31
Potential future activity	2	22	2	14	1	17	5	17
In process, but not available in writing	2	22	5	36	2	33	9	31
A draft plan or "plan for a plan" available in writing	1	11	0	0	0	0	1	3
Plan available according to project director	1	11	3	21	1	17	5	17
Totals	9		14		6		29	

There are six projects, including the one currently working on a plan, which had something available in writing at that time. Each of those six documents was evaluated using the checklist. Two of these projects indicated their comprehensive state dissemination plan was embedded within their capacity building proposals; their written proposals, therefore, were assessed against the other 13 elements of the checklist. For one of these states, only three of the thirteen elements were addressed fully in the proposal: a resource catalog existed, needs-sensing procedures were described and had been implemented, and

and an internal advisory group had been established. The other elements either were not presented or were discussed only in passing. The second state's project proposal went somewhat further. Though narrow in scope, a state dissemination system rationale was presented, and the linkage system, delivery strategies and marketing strategy were addressed, but with limited detail. The evaluation section concentrated only on awareness, training activities, search follow-up and impact; program resources were described for the capacity building project, but other SEA and state actors and financial resources were not included; also, the plan lacked a working definition of dissemination and descriptions of its clients, its coordination efforts and its system for integrating with existing program plans. On the other hand, both internal (SEA) and external (state) advisory groups were planned and development of a resource guide was a proposed first year activity. Hence, in view of the fact that this state was in its first year of capacity building, it had been comparatively successful in addressing the elements of a comprehensive plan.

The other four projects with written plans had developed stand-alone documents. One of those four plans included about half of the elements of a comprehensive state plan but only three elements were adequately described and much additional work was necessary before the document could satisfy the operational definition provided for a comprehensive state dissemination plan. The document for the second state included a plan which addressed all but four of the 13 elements by area, but only the rationale was adequately addressed. This state recognized this document was only "a plan for a plan" which was to be developed more fully later. The third state with a separate written plan addressed seven of the essential elements to some degree while three other elements were presented

but not discussed in detail. The only missing elements were a description of clients, a marketing strategy and the involvement of an advisory group in a planning and/or recommendation capacity.

The fourth and final state with a stand-alone written plan had developed three such comprehensive planning documents. The first plan analyzed state dissemination efforts relative to the Interstate Project on Dissemination. The second plan added the capacity building project. The third plan tied the dissemination effort to state efforts at developing selected minimum standards for education, and was being revised at the time of review. Collectively, these three plans contained all the elements of a comprehensive state dissemination plan except for a description of delivery strategies. A few elements were even well developed, such as a state definition of dissemination, a description of clients and a delineation of the functions and responsibilities (coordination) within the dissemination system. Although the other ten elements could have been addressed more fully, this state had the most fully developed comprehensive state dissemination plan at the time of these 1978 evaluation site visits.

Assessing the Current Status of Comprehensive State Dissemination Plans: February, 1980

As part of NTS' continuing evaluation of the SDGP, questionnaires were sent in November to the Project Director in each Capacity Building state and to the State Dissemination Leadership Project (SDLP) representative in non-Capacity Building states. By mid-March, responses were received from all but two of the 33 Capacity Building projects in Cohorts I-IV (those missing were one state from Cohort I and one from Cohort III) and from twelve of the 25 states without Capacity Building projects.

One of the questions on these instruments was:

> Does your state now have a written comprehensive state dissemination plan?
>
> Yes ____ No ____
>
> If yes, how is your project integrated into this plan? _____
>
> _____
>
> If no, what is the status of the plan's development? _____
>
> _____

The responses to this question for each Cohort of Capacity Building states and for the responding states without Capacity Building projects are given in Table 3.

Table 3

Status of States on the Development of Comprehensive State Dissemination Plans: February, 1980

Does a Written Comprehensive State Dissemination Plan Exist?	Number and Percent of States Capacity Building States (by Cohort) Cohort I*		Cohort II		Cohort III*		Cohort IV		Other States**	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	3	37	5	36	0	00	1	25	2	18
No	5	63	9	64	5	100	3	75	9	82
	9		14		6					

* One capacity building project in this cohort did not return the questionnaire in time to be analyzed.

** Twelve of the 25 non-Capacity Building states returned questionnaires and eleven answered this question.

One can see that, with only one exception, the chances a Capacity Building state will develop something they call a Comprehensive State Dissemination Plan increases as years of participation in the SDGP increase. The one exception had a planning grant prior to its first year in the program. Only two non-Capacity Building states developed something they called a Comprehensive State Dissemination Plan.

Of those states which said they did not presently have a Comprehensive State Dissemination Plan, several were in various stages of developing such a plan. As can be seen in Table 4, according to the Project Directors, the previously-mentioned trend is reversed, at least for the first three cohorts

Table 4

Status of Development of Comprehensive State Dissemination Plans for States Reporting No Plans Currently Available

	Number and Percent* of States									
	Capacity Building States (by Cohort)								Other States	
	Cohort I		Cohort II**		Cohort III		Cohort IV			
Status	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No plan in progress	4	80	2	25	1	20	2	67	5	56
Commitment by SEA leaders	0	0	1	13	0	0	0	0	0	0
Proposal stage or to be developed this year	1	20	2	25	1	20	1	33	4	44
In Process	0	0	2	25	2	40	0	0	0	0
Draft form available	0	0	1	13	1	20	0	0	0	0

* Percent based on total number of states without Comprehensive State Dissemination Plans.

** One Cohort II state which has most of the elements of a Comprehensive State Dissemination Plan already available in three draft documents reported having no plan and is not tallied here.

of Capacity Building states. This would imply that if a Capacity Building state has not developed a Comprehensive State Dissemination Plan by its third year of operation, its chances of developing such a plan are greatly lessened. For the non-Capacity Building states presently without a plan, none has yet reached the stage of having a Comprehensive State Dissemination Plan in progress.

Copies of Comprehensive State Dissemination Plans were requested from each state which reported having such a plan. Five of these states submitted their plans--four Capacity Building states (one from Cohort I, two from Cohort II and

one from Cohort IV) and one non-Capacity Building state. None of these plans had been reviewed previously.

The plan submitted by the non-Capacity Building state was written to specifically address ESEA Title IV operations in that state. A Title IV advisory group was involved in the effort, marketing strategies are presented, a system for coordinating Title IV activities exists, program resources are described and the evaluation procedures are indicated. However, the resources are not totally inventoried, the linkage system is not fully described and the other six elements of a comprehensive plan are not addressed, including a rationale and descriptions of clients and needs sensing.

Four Capacity Building states submitted written plans. The first state's plan is more of a "plan for a plan" as it only references or briefly describes the following elements: program resources, needs sensing, linkage system, marketing strategy, coordination system, delivery strategies, evaluation and program resources. Only the client population is adequately described.

The second plan was developed in response to a speech by the State Superintendent and contains specific dissemination plans for two programmatic areas in addition to a general plan. Each of the elements of a comprehensive state plan are addressed except for a working definition of dissemination and involvement of an advisory group. However, needs sensing has not been conducted and the linkage system is in its infancy. In addition, a marketing strategy is not described and only program personnel resources are indicated.

The remaining two plans are generally comprehensive. One of these plans contains all of the elements except for involvement of an advisory group, but only program personnel resources are described and the sections on clients, needs sensing, the linkage system and delivery strategy need additional development. The other plan was developed under a special purpose grant and contains all

elements except for a discussion of how this plan is to be integrated with other dissemination plans or SEA planning documents. In addition, the available resources, clients, marketing strategy and coordination system need to be explained more fully. This latter plan is so well written and contains such excellent sections on comparisons of vendors, linker attributes and other dissemination topics that it is a valuable addition to anyone's dissemination library (Hawaii Department of Education, 1979).

Discussion

The development of comprehensive state dissemination plans was examined to determine the effects of an unwritten press from federal program leaders for such development and to determine what relationship, if any, development of these plans had to do with other facets of an SEA dissemination system. As part of an earlier effort (Madey et al., 1979), each state was given a score on an Institutionalization scale based on identified indicants of institutionalization. Of the eight states which reported having a comprehensive state dissemination plan, only two states received Institutionalization scale scores below the top 12 rated states. Of these two states, one had a plan which was quite formative and the other did not submit the plan for review. Further analyses of these relationships will be completed in the near future as well as the relationships with other facets of an SEA dissemination system, including comprehensive resource base, coordinated resource base, comprehensive linkages, and available linkages, products and services.

Summary

A list of criteria was developed and presented to use in examining comprehensive state dissemination plans. These criteria were then applied to statewide, or SEA-wide, plans developed by states and submitted as part of the evaluation of the State Dissemination Grants Program (SDGP). It was concluded that unless comprehensive plans are developed within the first three years of SDGP, it was unlikely they would be developed in subsequent years. Also, few plans were reported as being developed by states which were not involved in the program. There appears to be a relationship between development of such plans and the chances for project institutionalization.

References

Madey, D. L., E. C. Royster, J. K. Decad, R. F. Baker, and E. W. Strang. An Evaluation of NIE's State Dissemination Grants Program: Interim Report. Durham, N.C.: NTS Research Corporation, August 1979.

Mojkowski, Charles. "Developing A Dissemination Plan." Unpublished paper, Durham, North Carolina: NTS Research Corporation, March 1978.

NWREL Dissemination Program, "Techniques for Gathering Information About State Dissemination Plans." Unpublished paper, Portland, Oregon: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, July 1978.

National Institute of Education (NIE). Program Announcement: State Dissemination Grants Program, FY1978.

Hawaii Department of Education. The Hawaii Educational Dissemination Diffusion System Plan. Office of the Superintendent, Planning and Evaluation Services Branch. June 1979.

NTS Paper Presentations at AERA 1980

"A New Model for Federal Change Agent Programs", Sol H. Pelavin*

22.14/Table 4 (Individually Scheduled Papers Division G, and Division A), Thursday Morning, 8:45-9:30, Civic Center (Room 200, 3rd Floor).

"An Empirical Comparison of Four Indicators of Test Speededness", Nick Maruhnich*

Session: 23.12/Effects from Bias, Test-Wiseness, Speededness and Guessing (Critique, Division D), Thursday Morning, 10:35-12:05, Sheraton (Clarendon, 3rd Floor)

"Assessing and Improving the Accuracy of Title I Evaluation with Grade-Appropriate Tests", Edward Moran, West Virginia Department of Education; Robert F. Baker* and Nick Maruhnich*

Session: 23.13/Methods of Program Evaluation (Paper Presentation, Division D), Thursday Morning, 10:35-12:05, Sheraton (Dalton Room, 3rd Floor)

"Policy Implications Analysis", Michael Everett, Indiana University; A. Jackson Stenner*

Session: 23.20/Evaluation Potpourri (Critique, Division H), Thursday Morning, 10:45-12:05, Sheraton (Gardner, 3rd Floor)

"An Application of Psychometric Procedures in the Non-Psychological Domain: Development of Dissemination System Scales Using Classical Test Theory and Rasch Scaling Techniques", Robert F. Baker*, Jolinda K. Decad*, Doren L. Madey*, and A. Jackson Stenner*

Session: 24.19/Applications of Latent Trait Theory, Sequential Analysis and Multi Dimensional Scaling, (Paper Presentation, Division D), Thursday Afternoon, 12:35-1:55, Sheraton (Beacon F, 3rd Floor)

"Tuition Assistance and Income Neutrality in College Choice", William Shaut, State University of New York, Central Administration; Robert J. Goettel*

Session: 24.31/The Impact of Student Financial Aid on Postsecondary Education (Critique, SIG/Postsecondary Education), Thursday Afternoon, 12:25-1:55, Civic Center (Revere, 3rd Floor).

"Evaluating Title I Early Childhood Programs: Problems, the Applicability of Model C, and Several Evaluation Plans", Keith McNeil* and Emily A. Findlay*

Session: 26.05/Multiple Regression Analysis - Application and Interpretation (Symposium, SIG/Multiple Linear Regression), Thursday Afternoon, 4:05-6:05, Sheraton (Constitution, 2nd Floor)

Discussant: Judy McNeil*

*NTS Employees

"Development of Comprehensive State Dissemination Plans: An Overview of Present Status", Joseph F. Haenn*

"Developing Empirical Descriptions of Educational Linkage Agents", Doren L. Madey* and Robert F. Baker*

Session: 3.11/ Perspectives on Knowledge Utilization at the System, Organizational and Individual Levels (Critique, SIG/Research Utilization), Monday Afternoon, 4:05-5:35, Sheraton (Exeter, 3rd Floor).

"State Grants for Capacity Building in Dissemination", Eugene C. Royster*

Session: 5.18/Relating Research to Policy on Dissemination Symposium, Division A), Tuesday Morning, 8:15-10:15, Sheraton (Beacon G, 3rd Floor).

"Effects of Magnet School Enrollment Changes on Desegregation", John C. Larson, Montgomery County Schools; Eugene C. Royster*

Session: 6.10/Perspectives on the Effectiveness of Desegregation (Paper Presentation, Division G), Tuesday Morning, 8:45-10:15, Civic Center (Room 202, 3rd Floor).

"The Distributions of NCE, Percentile and Grade Equivalent Scores Among Twelve Nationally Standardized Achievement Tests", Thomas B. Williams*

Session: 6.12/Achievement Testing: Methodological Issues (Critique, Division H), Tuesday Morning, 8:45-10:15, Civic Center (Revere, 3rd Floor).

"History and Development of the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education", Jan Shefter*, Diane Pelavin*, and Martin Orland*

"An Analysis of the Fund's Comprehensive Grant Program", Becky Jon Hayward*, Dan Johnston* and Diane Pelavin*

"An Analysis of the Achievements and Impacts of the Fund's Projects", Diane Pelavin*, Dan Johnston* and Jan Shefter*

"An Analysis of the Fund's Managemet Strategy", Martin Orland*, Becky Jon Hayward* and Jan Shefter*

"Hypotheses About the Successes of the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education", Sol H. Pelavin*, Martin Orland* and Becky Jon Hayward*

Session: 17.22/A Study of the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (Symposium, SIG/Postsecondary Education), Wednesday Afternoon, 2:15-3:45, Sheraton (Beacon F, 3rd Floor).

*NTS Employees

"Reasons Why Testing and Evaluations Don't Inform", Joseph F. Haenn*

Session: 28.19/SEA and LEA Strategies to Use Testing and Evaluation Information for Local School Improvement (Symposium, Division H), Friday Morning, 8:15-10:15, Sheraton (Constitution, 2nd Floor)

Critic: Robert J. Goettel*

"The Regression Route to Reliability Coefficients", Bob Burton, Applied Management Sciences; A. Jackson Stenner*

Session: 30.13/Test Reliability (Critique, Division D), Friday Morning, 10:35-12:05, Sheraton (Clarendon, 3rd Floor)

"What is Educational Significance?", Michael B. Bunch*

Session: 30.20/Evaluation Research: Impact on Policy (Critique, Division H), Friday Morning, 10:35-12:05, Sheraton (Gardner, 3rd Floor)

"Toward a Conceptual Framework for Understanding State and Local Implementation of Federal Aid Programs in Education", Martin E. Orland* and Robert J. Goettel*

Session: 30.22/Implementing Organizational Change (Paper Presentation, Division A), Friday Morning, 10:35-12:05, Sheraton (Beacon G, 3rd Floor)

"Test Item Development: An Empirical Study of Practical Problems", Nick Maruhnich* and Thomas Dunning*

Session: 32.09/Issues in Test Construction and Interpretation (Paper Presentation, Division D), Friday Afternoon, 2:15-3:45, Sheraton (Clarendon, 3rd Floor)

"Identification of Oral Communication Skills in Children and an Analysis of Developmental Differences in Performance", Jolinda K. Decad*

Session: 32.18/Oral Reading and Oral Communication in Children (Critique, Division C), Friday Afternoon, 2:15-3:45, Civic Center (Hancock, 3rd Floor)

*NTS Employees